

Appl. No. 10/768,271
Amtd. Dated Nov. 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claim 15, cancelled claims 16-18, kept claims 1-14 and 19 unchanged, and added new dependant claims 20-22. No new matter is entered.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 1-7, 10, 11 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohkawa (US 6,671,013B1).

In response to the rejection, Applicant has amended claim 15 to depend from claim 1, has cancelled claim 16-18, and hereby otherwise traverses the rejection of claims 1-7, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 19.

As regards independent claim 1, Applicant hereby respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons:

Claim 1, as originally filed, recites, in part:

“wherein a plurality of substantially triangular scatter enhancing regions is defined on the bottom surface adjacent to the light sources, and the diffusion dots in the scatter enhancing regions are larger than the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions.” (Emphasis added).

Ohkawa (US 6,671,013B1) discloses (Column 6 lines 11-14) that the projections 20 are distributed in a density (covering rate) getting larger gradually, according to increasing distance from the incidence face 12.

Appl. No. 10/768,271
Amdt. Dated Nov. 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

FIGS. 3a and 3b of Ohkawa illustrate different distribution density between area A relatively near to the incidence face 20 and area B relatively far from the incidence face 20. However, Ohkawa fails to disclose or otherwise suggest that the sizes of the individual dots in the scatter enhancing /darker regions ARE LARGER THAN that of the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions. In fact, the individual diffusion dots of Ohkawa, as presented in various Figures, all appear to be approximately the same size. In addition, in the Ohkawa's reference, "formation density" (i.e. covering rate) is defined as follows:

Covering rate=Cross section of projection cut along a general plane of the back face $14/(formation\ pitch)^2$ (column 6, lines 18-20).

"Density-covering rate gets gradually larger", as interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art, doesn't necessarily mean that "the sizes of dots in the scatter enhancing /darker regions ARE LARGER THAN those of the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions."

In other words, Ohkawa's reference is silent about and fails to expressly or inherently disclose or suggest that "the sizes of the dots in the scatter enhancing /darker regions ARE LARGER THAN those of the diffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions".

Therefore, Applicant submits that Ohkawa '013, taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, fails to teach or suggest the surface light source unit set forth in claim 1, as originally filed. Claim 1, as originally filed, is submitted to be in condition for allowance, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully

Appl. No. 10/768,271
Amdt. Dated Nov. 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

requested.

As regards original independent claim 15, Applicant has amended claim 15 to depend claim 1. Thus, claims 2-7, 10, 11, 14 and 15, depend from claim 1. Applicant hereby submits that claims 2-7, 10, 11, and 14, and claim 15 are in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

As regards independent claim 19, Applicant hereby respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 19, as originally filed, recites, in part:

“a plurality of diffusion dots formed on a bottom face of the light guide plate under a condition that the dot located in the brighter area and closer to the corresponding light source is smaller than dot which is in the same area while far away from the same corresponding light source, and **the dot located in the darker area is larger than the dot which is located in the brighter and closer to the corresponding light source.**”(Emphasis added).

Applicant refers to and relies on the reasons, as set forth above, in relation to claim 1. Ohkawa does not expressly or inherently disclose or otherwise suggest that “THE SIZES of the dots in the scatter enhancing/darker regions ARE LARGER THAN those of the disffusion dots in a remaining region of the bottom surface adjacent to the scatter enhancing regions”.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Ohkawa '013, taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, fails to teach or suggest the subject matter set forth in claim 19. That is, independent claim 19 is

Appl. No. 10/768,271
Amtd. Dated Nov. 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

submitted to be patentable over the prior art cited by Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Further, new claims 20-22 directly or indirectly depend from claim 19. Applicant thus submits that claims 20-22 are in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawa (US 6,671,013B1) and Ohkawa (US 6,755,546B2).

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 depend directly from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are now in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawa (US 6,671,013B1).

In response to this rejection, Applicant has cancelled claims 17 and 18. Further, claims 5, 6 and 14 depend directly from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 5, 6 and 14 are now in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/768,271
Amtd. Dated Nov. 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

With further respect to claim 14, Applicant submits that Ohkawa '013, by the Examiner's own admission, teaches away from modifying the display device disclosed thereby so as to further provide a prism sheet. In weighing the suggestive power of Ohkawa '013 (MPEP §2143.01), one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to modify Ohkawa '013 to provide a prism sheet. As such, Applicant submits that claim 14 is not rendered obvious by Ohkawa '013, whether taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references.

Applicant further submits that, if any of claims 1-14 and 19, none of which were amended hereby, are rejected under new grounds as part of the next Office Action, such an action cannot be made Final, in accordance with MPEP §706.07(a).

In view of the foregoing, the present application as defined in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Chuan-De Huang

By Jeffrey T. Knapp
Jeffrey T. Knapp

Registration No.: 45,384

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: 714/626-1229